S. CON. RES. 48

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) were added as cosponsors of S. Con. Res. 48, a concurrent resolution recognizing 375 years of service of the National Guard and affirming congressional support for a permanent Operational Reserve as a component of the Armed Forces.

S. RES. 401

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 401, a resolution expressing appreciation for Foreign Service and Civil Service professionals who represent the United States around the globe.

S. RES. 402

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 402, a resolution condemning Joseph Kony and the Lord's Resistance Army for committing crimes against humanity and mass atrocities, and supporting ongoing efforts by the United States Government and governments in central Africa to remove Joseph Kony and Lord's Resistance Army commanders from the battlefield.

S. RES. 446

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 446, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the United Nations and other intergovernmental organizations should not be allowed to exercise control over the Internet.

S. RES. 473

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 473, a resolution commending Rotary International and others for their efforts to prevent and eradicate polio.

S. RES. 482

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 482, a resolution celebrating the 100th anniversary of the United States Chamber of Commerce.

S. RES. 489

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 489, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate on the appointment by the Attorney General of an outside special counsel to investigate certain recent leaks of apparently classified and highly sensitive information on United States military and intelligence plans, programs, and operations.

S. RES. 490

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 490, a resolution designating the week of September 16, 2012, as ''Mitochondrial Disease Awareness Week'', reaffirming the importance of an enhanced and coordinated research effort on mitochondrial diseases, and commending the National Institutes of Health for its efforts to improve the understanding of mitochondrial diseases.

S. RES. 494

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 494, a resolution condemning the Government of the Russian Federation for providing weapons to the regime of President Bashar al-Assad of Syria.

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 494, supra.

S. RES. 496

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 496, a resolution observing the historical significance of Juneteenth Independence Day.

AMENDMENT NO. 2202

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2202 proposed to S. 3240, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2017, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2295

At the request of Mr. UDALL of Colorado, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2295 proposed to S. 3240, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2017, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2355

At the request of Mr. PRYOR, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2355 proposed to S. 3240, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2017, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2382

At the request of Mr. CORKER, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2382 proposed to S. 3240, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2017, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. SNOWE) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2382 proposed to S. 3240, supra.

AMENDMENT NO. 2395

At the request of Mr. AKAKA, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2395 intended to be proposed to S. 3240, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2017, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2417

At the request of Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2417 intended to be proposed to S. 3240, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2017, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2445

At the request of Mr. BROWN of Ohio, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. NELSON) and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2445 proposed to S. 3240, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2017, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2453

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. SNOWE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2453 proposed to S. 3240, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2017, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2457

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, her name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2457 proposed to S. 3240, an original bill to reauthorize agricultural programs through 2017, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WEBB) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2457 proposed to S. 3240, supra.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. FRANKEN (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. COONS, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. KERRY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Mr. LAUTENBERG):

S. 3317. A bill to restore the effective use of group actions for claims arising under title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, title I of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, title V of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, section 1977 of the Revised Statutes, and the Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act of 2008, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, our daughters' futures will be as bright as our sons'. That is the American promise. It is the American ideal—that one's opportunity to prosper—one's economic security—depends not on one's gender but instead on one's work ethic—one's character—one's God-given talents.

That men and women will be treated equally in America is a promise that was a made by Susan B. Anthony, who dedicated her life to women's suffrage and who famously said, shortly before her passing, that ''failure is impossible.'' History proved her right: 15

years later, women finally were given access to the ballot.

That men and women will be treated equally in America is a promise that was made a generation later, by thousands of women who—under the banner of Rosie the Riveter—took to the factories and carried our national economy through a period of world war.

That men and women will be treated equally in America is a promise that was made by Ruth Bader Ginsburg, who, in 1960, was passed over for a Supreme Court clerkship because she was a woman. Undeterred, she went on to start the Women's Rights Project at the ACLU, a platform from which she argued several landmark cases. In 1993, she was selected to serve as a justice on the very court that, years before, turned her away.

That men and women will be treated equally in America is a promise that is made today—by women like Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI and Senator PATTY MURRAY and Congresswoman ROSA DELAURO—women who have settled not for a mere presence in the halls of Congress but who instead have become among its most influential leaders.

Generations of women have rejected inferiority. Because of these pioneers, the promise of gender equality in America has become more than just a promise. It has become our law. It is enshrined in the documents by which we are governed.

This week, we celebrate the 40th anniversary of Title 9, a statute that guarantees equal educational opportunities for boys and girls—for men and women. In just a couple of years, we will mark the 50th anniversary of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, a landmark legislative achievement that codified our national commitment to ending discrimination in the workplace.

So, yes, in America we have made a promise that one's gender will not be the deciding factor between having opportunities and being denied opportunities—between getting a job and being denied one—between getting a promotion and being denied one. We have made that promise. And we've come a long way toward fulfilling it.

But we are not there yet. Even though women have been working outside the home for generations, they continue to face barriers in the workplace: Even though about half of all workers are women, only 12 Fortune 500 companies have female CEOs. The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission reports that, in 2011, it received nearly 100,000 complaints of discrimination. Statistics show that women still receive unequal pay for equal work.

Although this week marks the 40th anniversary of Title 9, it also marks the one year anniversary of the Supreme Court's decision in Wal-Mart v. Dukes, a decision that has had an enormous impact on workplace rights across the country. On its face, that case was about civil procedure—it was about litigation rules and legal technicalities. But, in a larger sense, the Dukes case was about the current state of our equal employment laws.

In that case, a group of women tried to band together to enforce their rights to be free from discrimination—rights afforded them by Title 7 of the Civil Rights Act. The women alleged that their employer's policies allowed bias—rather than performance and merit—to determine who would be promoted or given raises.

The evidence in the case indicated that women comprised 70 percent of the employer's hourly workforce but only 33 percent of its management team. The evidence indicated that women were paid less than men in each of the employer's 41 regions. It indicated that managers around the country relied on outdated stereotypes when making employment decisions. Both the trial court and the appellate court agreed that the women should be permitted to try their case as a group.

The trial court's and the appellate court's decisions were consistent with precedent. Governing rules said that a group of workers could band together if they first showed, among other things, that their cases shared a common issue of law or fact. This is known as the ''commonality'' requirement. The idea here is that if lots of workers raise a common issue, it's easier for the court to resolve that issue in one case than to resolve it over and over and over again in thousands of different cases.

In Dukes, the common, central issue was whether the employer's policy of giving managers unfettered discretion to make pay and promotion decisions resulted in a disparate impact on women. In other words, all of the workers alleged that the employer's policy allowed bias to determine conditions of employment. Because the workers had presented that common question, ''Is the employer's policy discriminatory''; the lower courts concluded that the group could proceed together.

But the Supreme Court concluded otherwise. Its rationale was unprecedented. In a 5 to 4 decision, the Court said that, to proceed as a group, the women had to show not only that they were united by a common issue, but also that they ultimately would prevail on that issue at trial. That is, to present their case, the women first had to prove their case. As Justice Ginsburg explained in her dissenting opinion, the Court's decision ''disqualifies the class from the starting gate.''

Since Dukes was decided, dozens of employment discrimination cases effectively have been stopped before they even started. This is a problem. When Congress passed the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Committee responsible for the bill issued a report in which it said that ''[t]he Committee agrees with the courts that Title 7 actions are by their very nature class complaints, and that any restriction on such actions would greatly undermine the effectiveness of Title 7.''

But it doesn't take a Congressional Committee report to understand the effect of the Dukes decision. Betty Dukes, the lead plaintiff in the case, put it well when she testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee. She said that, quote, ''[o]ur civil rights are only as valuable as the means that exist to enforce them.'' It is one thing to pass a law saying that men and women should be treated equally. It is another thing to give that law some teeth—to say that we really mean it.

The Dukes decision makes it harder for women—for any group of workers, for that matter—to band together to enforce the Civil Rights Act. Unable to band together, many workers may not have access to legal representation. Unable to band together, many workers will choose not to challenge workplace discrimination at all, concluding that the personal costs of doing so—the potential for retaliatory actions—outweigh any possible benefits. Unable to band together, workers will be less able to use the courts to address employers' discriminatory policies on a company-wide basis.

So, today, on the one year anniversary of the Court's decision in Dukes, I rise to introduce the Equal Employment Opportunity Restoration Act. This bill will restore workers' ability to enforce effectively our Nation's antidiscrimination laws. Perhaps as importantly, this bill reaffirms the American promise of workplace equality.

The bill creates a new judicial procedure—called a ''group action''—which mirrors the class action procedures that were available to workers before Dukes was decided. Instead of disqualifying workers' cases at the starting gate, this bill says that workers can proceed together if they create a reasonable inference that they were subjected to a discriminatory employment policy or practice. It will be—as it always has been—left to a trial to determine the merits of the workers' allegations and the viability of the employers' defenses.

I am proud to introduce this bill with Congresswoman DELAURO and with my Senate colleagues, including Senators LEAHY, MIKULSKI, MURRAY, and HARKIN.

I am grateful to the many wonderful organizations in Minnesota and Washington that have worked with me on this bill. They include the National Partnership on Women and Families, the ACLU, the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, the National Women's Law Center, the American Association of University Women, and the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law.

Our daughters' futures will be as bright as our sons'. For more than a century, we have followed a path toward gender equality. The trail has been blazed by generations of women—women whose names are found in the history books, yes, but also by those whose names are not—the working mother who rises before dawn and punches a clock every day so she can

support her family—the young woman, fresh out of college, who defies stereotypes and pursues an engineering career—the small business-owner who hires dozens of people in her community.

We should continue along the path toward equality in the workplace. We should not stop now. We should not turn back now. The bill that we introduce today says that we won't.

Mr. LEAHY. Today, I am pleased to join Senator FRANKEN to introduce the Equal Employment Opportunity Restoration Act of 2012. This important legislation will respond to the Supreme Court's decision in Wal-Mart v. Dukes, and restore women's ability to challenge discrimination in the workplace.

Today marks the 1 year anniversary of that case—where just five Justices disqualified the claims of 1.5 million women who had spent nearly a decade seeking justice for sex discrimination by their employer, Wal-Mart. By a 5–4 decision, the Supreme Court ruled that the women did not share enough in common to support bringing a class action. Perhaps more troubling, just five Justices said that Wal-Mart could not have had a discriminatory policy against all of them, because it left its payment decisions to the local branches of its stores. In reaching this conclusion, the Supreme Court provided a clear path for corporations to avoid company-wide sex discrimination suits, and made it harder to hold corporations accountable under our historic civil rights laws.

Betty Dukes has worked for Wal-Mart, where she started as a part-time cashier in Pittsburg, California, for almost 20 years. Throughout her years at Wal-Mart, Betty expressed an interest in advancement and in the management track. Unfortunately, she was continually overlooked for promotions, receiving only one in her lengthy career there. Betty Dukes then learned of the pay disparities between the male and female employees at a Pittsburg Wal-Mart store. She decided to take a stand, and filed a class action lawsuit against Wal-Mart in 2001. Betty Dukes and the other women were appalled to learn that the pay disparities did not stop at the Pittsburg store. In fact, there was widespread gender discrimination occurring at Wal-Mart stores across the country.

Last year, I chaired a hearing on how Supreme Court rulings affect Americans' access to their courts. Betty Dukes came and shared her story at that hearing. She made it clear that she did not plan on giving up. In these tough economic times, American consumers and employees rely on the law to protect them from fraud and discrimination. They rely on the courts to enforce laws intended to protect them. Unfortunately, these protections are being eroded by what appears to be the most business-friendly Supreme Court in the last 75 years.

The Supreme Court's recent decisions make some wonder whether it has now decided that some corporations are too big to be held accountable. Whether it is Lilly Ledbetter suing her employer for gender discrimination, or a group of consumers suing their phone company for deceptive practices, an activist majority of the Supreme Court is making it more and more difficult for Americans to have their day in court.

We cannot ignore the fact that gender discrimination in the workplace persists. Earlier this month, I urged the Senate to pass the Paycheck Fairness Act, a bill that would have set a clear path to address the systemic problems that result from pay disparities. Unfortunately, the Senate could not overcome a partisan filibuster, and was not able to even debate the measure.

I believe that the ability of Americans to band together to hold corporations accountable, especially when it comes to workplace discrimination, has been seriously undermined by the Supreme Court. All people should be evaluated on the basis of their contribution to the workplace, not irrelevant factors like sex, gender, race, ethnicity, or disability. These decisions have been praised on Wall Street, but will no doubt hurt hardworking Americans on Main Street. I thank Senator FRANKEN for introducing this important bill, and urge all Senators to come together and support this effort to restore hardworking Americans' access to their courts.

By Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself and Mr. INHOFE):

S. 3321. A bill to promote permanent families for children, privacy and safety for unwed mothers, responsible fatherhood, and security for adoptive parents by establishing a National Responsible Father Registry and encouraging States to enter into agreements to contribute the information contained in the State's Responsible Father Registry to the National Responsible Father Registry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I bring to the attention of the body a bill called the Protecting Adoption and Promoting Responsible Fatherhood Act of 2012. I introduced this bill on behalf of myself and Senator INHOFE, with whom I have worked with so closely on many issues involving adoption and the protection of children who are outside of family care, both here in the United States and abroad. I thank Senator INHOFE, the senior Senator from Oklahoma, for being an original cosponsor of this legislation. I also thank Congresswoman LAURA RICHARDSON for introducing a companion piece of this legislation in the House today.

We just celebrated Father's Day this past weekend. I know my father and my husband and men all over the country celebrated with their children and their families. We honor the extraordinary fathers in the world.

Parenthood is the ultimate gift. It is also an incredible responsibility. Many of us have benefited from really wonderful fathers who care for and support families and support children through their young years, their adult years, and even into their older years. When fathers are absent, when they abandon their responsibility to their children, they can make the mothers of their children and their children more vulnerable. Sometimes women will make a decision to place a child for adoption if they are unmarried, unwilling, unable—just at a vulnerable time in their life and not able to raise a child. Adoption can be a very positive option. There are some Members of our Congress who have adopted children and have adopted grandchildren, so we know the blessings of adoption.

This bill will help to facilitate and clear up some legal quagmires that occur until many States clear the way for women of any age to make a decision for adoption. There are many of us, across party lines, who have supported more domestic infant adoption, more domestic adoptions for children of all ages, and particularly adoption of special-needs children.

This bill really affects infant adoption. It sets up a voluntary registry that tracks what 38 States have already done. Any person, any male who has the intention of supporting and raising a child can register on this registry, and their will and wishes will be taken into consideration. But in the situation that often happens where this man is not interested in being the kind of responsible father he should be, then this registry helps to expedite, without a lot of legal quagmire but with protection to both the father and the mother, to expedite adoption.

It has gone through a vetting process with any number of outside organizations. I thank the American Bar Association. I want to particularly thank the Association of Adoption Attorneys, which helped to draft this important piece of legislation.

I wanted to come to the floor to introduce it. We will, of course, bring it up when the leadership allows us that opportunity. It may have to go through a committee process. We may be able to clear it with the support of both Republicans and Democrats, as is shown by the support of Senator INHOFE and myself. Hopefully we can get it done in a short period of time and provide a clear path to promote adoption in the United States.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 3323. A bill to amend the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to improve the protections for servicemembers against mortgage foreclosures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, today I introduce the Military Family Home Protection Act, a bill to strengthen the legal protections our military personnel are guaranteed under the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act, SCRA.

Entering military service can sometimes make it difficult or impossible for our Soldiers, Sailors, Airmen, and Marines to meet their civilian legal and financial obligations. In laws dating back to the Civil War, Congress has given active-duty military personnel special protections against legal actions that might be taken against them while they are away from home because of military service. The purpose of these laws, according to a 1943 Supreme Court decision, is ''to protect those who have been obliged to drop their own affairs to take up the burden of the nation.'' Congress re-wrote the World War II-era ''Soldiers and Sailor Relief Act'' in 2003, as full-time military, Reservists, and National Guard personnel were deploying in large numbers to Iraq and Afghanistan. This comprehensively updated statute was re-named the ''Servicemembers Civil Relief Act.''

Since the September 11 attacks, we have asked our military personnel—both our active-duty and reserve components—for unprecedented service and sacrifice. We have asked them to deploy multiple times to Iraq and Afghanistan, and we have asked their families to live without their loved ones for long periods of time. We have asked our National Guard and Reserve personnel—not just once, but sometimes two or three times—to leave their jobs, put their civilian lives on hold, and answer their country's call to service. The promise the SCRA makes to these Americans is that while they are engaged in the defense of our country, we will protect them and their families from adverse financial actions on the home front. One important way the SCRA protects these servicemembers is by lowering their mortgage interest rates while they are on active duty, and by prohibiting banks from foreclosing on their homes without first getting court approval.

Unfortunately, as I learned during a joint House-Senate forum I held in the Senate Commerce Committee hearing room in July 2011, not all banks have been following the law. In May 2011, for example, the Department of Justice settled lawsuits with the former Countrywide Home Loans, now a subsidiary of Bank of America, and Saxon Mortgage, a subsidiary of Morgan Stanley, for $22 million. In these lawsuits, DOJ alleged that the companies violated the SCRA by foreclosing on more than 170 servicemembers without court orders. At the House-Senate forum, which I organized with Representative ELIJAH CUMMINGS, the Ranking Member of the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee, we heard from two members of the military and other experts about how these SCRA violations can devastate military families. Mrs. Holly Petraeus, who is the Director of Servicemember Affairs at the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, as well as the wife of General David Petraeus, told us that:

. . . [W]hile a foreclosure is devastating for any American family, it can be especially painful for military families. Both the family back home and the deployed servicemember, who feels helpless to take action to prevent the foreclosure, are put in a terrible situation. It is vital that servicemembers receive all the protections afforded to them by the SCRA.

At the time we held this forum, legislators in both houses were already hard at work on legislation to strengthen the SCRA and improve banks' compliance with the SCRA. In late 2010, Congress passed a new law, P.L. 111–275, that allowed deploying soldiers to terminate their cell phone contracts without penalties, and that gave the United States Attorney General new powers to enforce the SCRA against creditors. In June 2011, the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee, on which I serve, approved a bill sponsored by Senator BEGICH, S. 941, which included a provision to extend the period of SCRA mortgage protections from nine months to twelve months after a servicemember leaves military duty. The Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee is also actively considering other proposals to improve the SCRA.

The legislation I am introducing today with Senator CARDIN was introduced in the House of Representatives as H.R. 5747 on May 15, 2012, by Ranking Member CUMMINGS, along with the Ranking Member of the House Armed Services Committee, Representative ADAM SMITH, and the Ranking Member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, Representative BOB FILNER. Two days later, it was adopted as an amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act by an overwhelming vote of 394–27.

Now that the House has expressed its bipartisan support for this legislation, I am introducing it in the Senate for consideration. The recent House vote shows that this is an issue that should rise above partisan politics. I hope that the House's recent action will give the Senate new momentum to look at what we can do to strengthen the SCRA and protect our military personnel and their families. A short summary of the bill is provided below.

The Military Family Home Protection Act expands the class of covered individuals under the SCRA's mortgage provisions to include: All servicemembers serving on the battlefield, regardless of when they bought their home. Servicemembers retiring 100 percent disabled due to service-connected injuries and surviving spouses of servicemembers who died in military service.

The act stays mortgage foreclosure proceedings against SCRA-covered persons for 1 year following their service; it also eliminates a current sunset provision that will reduce this protection to 90 days beginning January 1, 2013.

The Act doubles the civil penalty for SCRA mortgage violations to $110,000 for the first offense and $220,000 for subsequent violations.

The act protects servicemembers and their families against discrimination by banks and lenders on account of servicemembers' eligibility for SCRA protections. It also requires banks and lenders to take further steps to ensure SCRA compliance. These steps include: Designating an SCRA compliance officer. Requiring SCRA compliance officers to distribute information to servicemembers about their SCRA protections, and providing a toll-free telephone number and website to help servicemembers better understand their SCRA protections.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 500—CELEBRATING THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF TITLE IX OF THE EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1972, ALSO KNOWN AS THE PATSY TAKEMOTO MINK EQUAL OPPORTUNITY IN EDUCATION ACT, AND RECOGNIZING THE NEED TO CONTINUE PURSUING THE GOAL OF EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR ALL WOMEN AND GIRLS

Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN of Massachusetts, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. CASEY, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. COONS, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. HARKIN, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. KERRY, Mr. KIRK, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TESTER, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. ISAKSON, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Ms. AYOTTE, Mrs. MCCASKILL, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 500

Whereas 40 years ago, on June 23, 1972, title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 (in this preamble referred to as ''title IX'') (20 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.) was signed into law by the President of the United States;

Whereas Representatives Patsy T. Mink and Edith Green led the successful fight in Congress to pass this legislation;

Whereas, on October 29, 2002, title IX was named the ''Patsy Takemoto Mink Equal Opportunity in Education Act'' in recognition of Representative Mink's heroic, visionary, and tireless leadership in developing and passing title IX;

Whereas title IX prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex in the administration of any education program receiving Federal financial assistance, including sports, and bars sexual and sex-based harassment, discrimination against pregnant and parenting students, and the use of stereotypes and other barriers to limit a person's access to a particular educational field;

Whereas remarkable gains have been made to ensure equal opportunity for women and girls under the inspiration and mandate of title IX;

Whereas title IX has increased educational opportunities for women and girls, including their access to professional schools and nontraditional fields of study, and has improved their employment opportunities;